

HTTPbis BOF

IETF 69, Chicago

BOF Chairs:

Mark Nottingham <mnot@mnot.net>

Alexey Melnikov <alexey.melnikov@isode.com>

Mailing List: <mailto:ietf-http-wg@w3.org>

Jabber: httpbis@jabber.ietf.org

Agenda

- Agenda Bashing, scribes, blue sheets, etc. (5 mins)
- Problem summary (5 mins)
- Review of draft-lafon-rfc2616bis-03.txt:
 - status and open issues [1] (20 mins)
- Review of existing HTTP authentication
 - mechanisms [2] (15 mins)
- Review of issues with HTTP caching and cookies (10 mins)
- Review of ETags on write issues (5 mins)
- General discussion about formation of the WG (10 mins)
 - - if no interest in the WG, then spend more time
 - on discussing 2616bis issues
- Is revision of RFC 2617 in scope for the WG? (20 mins)
- Should rewrite of RFC 2616 be allowed by the Charter?
(20 mins)
- When, if and how interop work should take place (10 mins)
- Other issues with the proposed Charter (10 mins)
- Closing discussion about formation of the WG (20 mins)
-

Total: 150 minutes

HTTP Authentication

- e.g. anonymous read of documents doesn't require any authentication
- write (PUT/DELETE/...) would require ...

Rules of engagement

- Target: move RFC 2616 and possibly other HTTP related RFCs to Draft standard
 - **NO NEW FEATURES**
 - Remove unused/broken features
 - Clarify things which are unclear
 - Fix contradictions
 - “Small” functional changes for interop problems are fine
- (side-effect) suggest replacement for features which can't be fixed, but work will not be done in the same WG (*not before rechartering anyway*)

Lisa

Revise RFC 2617?

- RFC 2617 defines Basic and Digest authentication
- Yes – revise both in HTTPbis WG
- Yes – revise Basic only
- No (can be revised in another WG or as individual submission)
- [Cyrus to talk to about splitting RFC 2617 into 3 parts]

Rewrite RFC 2616 from scratch?

- Yes
- No
- Decide later (compare draft-lafon-rfc2616bis with a full rewrite)
 - Deadline for the new draft (full rewrite) is needed

Other RFCs to be revised by the WG?

- RFC 2965 - HTTP State Management Mechanism
 - Yes
 - No (or maybe later after rechartering)
- RFC 2818 (HTTP TLS)
- RFC 2817 (Upgrade to TLS in HTTP)

Other documents to be produced by the WG?

- Document problems with caching, cookies ?
- Document problems with Etags ?
- Document Best Practice for selected difficult issues

Is there any interest to form one or more WGs?

- Yes
- No
- Maybe (more discussion needed)